REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-24 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 being the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 are sought to be amended. Claims 6 and 10 are cancelled. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,838 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Deering"), in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2003/0233592 A1 (hereinafter referred to as "Lin") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,256,788 (hereinafter referred to as "Luu"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with respect to pending claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-24 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 have been amended to include a similar feature of signaling an interrupt, as follows: signaling of an interrupt to the first processor by the second processor upon completion of the second task to indicate that the data store is available for

use by the first processor (claim 1); wherein the processor to signal an interrupt to a central

processing unit (CPU) upon completion of the rendering the one or more graphics surfaces to

indicate that a data store is available for use by the CPU (claim 8); wherein the graphics

controller to signal an interrupt to the CPU upon completion of at least one of rendering of the

image and displaying of the image on the monitor to indicate that a data store is available for

use by the CPU (claim 14); and wherein the target processor to signal an interrupt to the

processor upon completion of at least one of the plurality of tasks to indicate that a data store

is available for use by the processor (claim 21). Support for the Amendment can be found in

original claim 6 and in the specification at least on page 10, paragraph 0027.

Lin, Deering and Luu, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest

this similar feature of signaling an interrupt, as claimed. The Examiner acknowledges that

neither Lin nor Deering teaches this claimed feature. The Examiner cites Luu (col. 4, lines

39-49) and states that when the graphics processing is completed in Luu, the GPU sends an

interrupt to the CPU to indicate that it is ready to receive additional commands. This is very

different from the present claimed invention where the signaling of the interrupt is used to

indicate that a data store is available for use. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 8,

14 and 21 and their respective dependent claims 2-5, 9, 11-13 and 15-24 are distinguishable

from Lin, Deering and Luu, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests that the rejections to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be

reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the Office Action's rejection

with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby

reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the

dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on

additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A

detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of

the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931

if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 18, 2008

/Molly A. McCall/ Reg. No. 46,126
Molly A. McCall
Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402

P18586ReplyFinalOA